D618
C532

The Divinity School News

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Vol. XVI AUGUST 1, 1949 No. 3

Published quarterly by the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, 58o[illegible] Ellis Ave., February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1. Entered as second-class matter, March 29, 1934, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of February 28, 1925, authorized April 18, 1934.

LIBRARY OF
Bangalore Theological Seminary
AUG 26 1949

RESPONSE FROM THE FIELD

In a recent issue of the *Divinity School News* it was reported that those of us working at "home plate" were interested in developing a closer fellowship with the men and women in the field. It was suggested that we at Chicago were realizing more than ever how much we were dependent upon such a closer working relationship. And it was reported that we are receiving an increasing number of requests from alumni and alumnae for the development of closer community. Accordingly, the editor of the *News* announced a willingness to use more space for the purpose of conversation and exchange of experience between the School and the field. An invitation was given to all those sharing this conviction regarding the need for closer community to write letters to the editor. Owing to the fact, however, that none of the alumni responded to this invitation, the editor wrote a letter to two men asking them to prepare a statement which could be printed in the next issue of the *News*.

The following pages carry articles from Paul Wassenich, at the University of Texas, and Duncan Littlefair, at the Fountain Street Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan. These two men were selected because they were personally known to the editor, because they and the editor held conversations concerning Divinity affairs during the past year, and because it was known that these men were actually striving to apply the disciplines of their Divinity experience to the existential needs in their respective situations. The letter inviting Wassenich and Littlefair to submit statements posed this question for their consideration: "What kinds of problems are you encountering and what insights are you developing in your daily efforts to exercise your Divinity training in behalf of the existential needs of the situation in which you are working? And what implications might this general experience have for school-alumni relations and for the program and relationships within the School?" Without making any further comment, I submit the statements of Wassenich and Littlefair for your consideration.

From Paul G. Wassenich at Austin, Texas:

Dean Hawley's suggestion that we use the *Divinity School News* as a means of communication among the alumni hits the spot with me. I would rather read what some of the rest of you write than write myself, but Bill has assigned me an article and made the assignment stick. I hope that we will be reading articles that reflect *your* reaction to rather specific problems right along. This does not mean that I would not like to see articles by members of the faculty, for those are vital and helpful. But it means that, instead of simply publishing some address that has been made at the Divinity School, we appreciate the chance to hear from alumni across the country who are in pulpit, classroom, or other positions. If the Chicago faculty articles can alternate with or parallel these articles from across the country, it will interest me greatly.

The type of thing that Bill wanted was the reflections of an alumnus in the field upon the adequacy of the training Chicago gave him and also a reaction to what is now going on at Chicago.

I

We alumni may overemphasize it, but I believe it is definitely true that the Chicago man comes out stamped with a methodological approach to truth which is more rigorous and less sentimental than that of other seminarians. Of course, in its worst manifestations this may become cynical and destructive. But my honest evaluation of Chicago men as I meet them in all kinds of situations is that they are unusually effective and reasonable men who are a bit less sentimental and a bit more realistic than the average preacher or teacher of religion.

This fact, springing from the basic empiricism dominant there, creates something of a chasm between Chicago men and others. To be sure, we have found friends among men from other schools and can work with people of widely divergent points of view (else we would not be in public work of any kind). But it seems to me that the average Chicago alumnus has a mocking little green devil (or is it God?) sitting over him and saying, "Now, is that honest?" "Do you really *know* that?" "Aren't you just assuming that?" "Isn't that simply an easy tradition you are exploiting?" "Where's your authority for that statement?" And in a time of such strategic and rapid change as this those are very important questions for religious leaders to ask themselves in all integrity. Elton Trueblood speaks helpfully of the need for a life of discipline in all significant living. I am sure there is discipline involved in nearly all graduate education, but that at Chicago is apparently unusually rigorous. It meant a great deal to me to be forced into the rigorous study schedule I kept there.

Though the Divinity School is noted negatively for its lack of orthodoxy, its positive strength lies in its ability to develop truly creative thinkers who do not follow religious precedent simply because it is the path of least resistance. Neo-orthodoxy makes a great and easy appeal to preachers today because it is so nearly like funda-

mentalism in its popular version. There is considerable pressure from the pew for the preacher to move in that direction. It requires so much more hard work and difficult disagreement with the majority to forward the more rational ideas of men like Whitehead, Hartshorne, Wieman, *et al.* I find that the Chicago man can recognize the values of Niebuhr and even Barth and yet remain basically critical, whereas usually other men become violently partisan. In other words, I think Chicago produces, on the whole, a more consistently critical mind and persons emotionally capable of following truth wherever it leads. This sense of difference creates a need for fellowship among the Chicago men which will provide a continuing means for exchange of ideas and application of our fundamental assumptions to changing conditions.

II

Let me inject here some recent experiences and reflections on Chicago men and ideas at work in society.

My present work is as an instructor in undergraduate Bible at the University of Texas. The State University is a place which is highly "secular." Though I do not like that word, I know no better word to convey quickly what I mean. It is religiously disinterested, obsessed with mundane goals that have an inadequate value context. There are highly disciplined minds in engineering, law, economics, physics, even football. But an amazing number of people—both students and faculty members—have no disciplined and rational approach to religion. They often make sentimental assumptions about religion. Some are emotionally religious and get a hurt look in their eyes when one brings the light of scholarship and reason to bear upon the problems of biblical study and theology. Others are sentimentally antireligious and sneer when any religious evaluations are made. One faculty member told a class pressing him for the religious implications of John Dewey's position: "Oh, either forget religion altogether or take it in its purest fundamentalist form." Such complete lack of comprehension of the sort of philosophical approach that we from Chicago make is most disheartening in a mature philosopher.

There is genuine pleasure in discussions that Bob Ledbetter and I have in the light of the above facts. Bob and I, along with some others in the area who are sympathetic with genuine liberalism, have some most rewarding experiences. I find it very satisfying to take undergraduates through the paces on Bible. I always try to do a constructive job and relate the biblical insights to the fundamental issues today, which is not too difficult to do. Of course, there are seventy-five out of a hundred who do not become vitally concerned. But the twenty-five who do care and comprehend the fundamental issues come back time and again to discuss them with me. It is very satisfying to find them saying anonymously on teacher-evaluation sheets: "This is the most interesting course I've had in the university." "This course has brought order out of chaos in my religious thinking." "This course has helped me to see the development of religion in the past and to be concerned with its development in the present."

There are also a handful of faculty members who work most intelligently and even sacrificially to relate enlightened religious concepts to their various fields of study and to help religious professionals develop members of the church to a point of intelligent religious commitment.

One of the most heartening experiences I have had in recent months was a conference sponsored by the YM–YW at S.M.U., Dallas. It brought together college and university administrators, deans of men and women, and teachers with chaplains, pastors, and "Y" secretaries to discuss religion and higher education. On the program as speakers were Elbert Cole, former chaplain at Chicago and now pastor of University Methodist Church, St. Louis; Dr. H. R. Mundhencke of T.C.U.'s Department of Economics; and myself. We shared insights about relating values to all fields of study in the curriculum and discussed the consequent awareness and commitment that could be developed by this method of relating religion and education.

At approximately the same time, I was with W. Oliver Harrison (A.M. '38), who is pastor of First Christian Church in Corpus Christi. I spoke to his annual men's retreat on "The Church, the Bible, and Prayer." Oliver has been working most effectively there for about five years. The fruits of his labor were quite apparent as I talked with these men. There was a sanity, a reasonableness, and a commitment that clearly indicated that valid liberalism does not necessarily lead to a religious letdown, as is often charged.

Bob Ledbetter, who teaches Bible for the Wesley Foundation here, is continually bringing students around to a reasonable view of religion and a deep commitment thereto. He is also demonstrating the implications of it in community work he does. He served last year as chairman of the Board of Inter-American House, which has sought to create inter-American fellowship around democratic values.

III

Now, allow me a few words about the Divinity School itself. I think it is a salutary development that a full-time Dean of Students has been appointed. Though Chicago has a right to expect and does get men and women who are able to take tough schedules of hard work in a rarefied atmosphere, nevertheless, all people have certain needs for friendly counsel when they are facing difficult issues, as all do at Chicago. I think the addition of Bill Hawley to the staff will help greatly in this matter. In fact, I would like to see the drab gray gothic of Swift Hall enlivened with a bright blue or red "Welcome" sign over the door of the Dean of Students. It is a frequent comment of Chicago men that they felt that nobody gave a rap whether they lived or died around there.

I have heard it said fairly often by alumni that they hesitate to send certain capable men to Chicago because they feel that those men could not take the emotional stress that develops and that no friendly counsel is given. A dean of students who is sympathetic and aware of the nature of the emotional problems that do develop under

sustained, disciplined study, plus an inadequate social life program, reassures me considerably about recommending Chicago to young men. There are many men who can handle the intellectual venture at Chicago, but they need a "friendly ear" now and then when they get intellectual indigestion or "Ph.D.-itis," as it is popularly referred to. If this counselor can have an official status, as the present Dean of Students has, I think that this should have a definitely constructive effect.

Again, it is often said that Chicago is not adequately in touch with the churches, not even with the ecumenical movement. I would like to have seen the Chicago faculty more fully involved in Amsterdam. If our independence of thought is going to alienate us from the ecumenical movement, then we probably need to do some serious thinking about its implications. It is true that Barthianism has the inside track in the churches these days, particularly when Europe is included, and that our point of view is so clearly in the minority that we are excluded by sheer weight of church opinion. But my point is that Chicago has made too little effort to reach into the life of the churches, to care about the problems as the church faces them, and to get embroiled in the issues the churches are laboring over. If I understand Hawley, that is a point at which he hopes to be helpful—as a liaison man between the pastors and the Divinity School faculty.

I have occasionally met a member of the faculty at conferences of my own denomination or state councils of churches, etc. Perhaps Dean Hawley or someone else on the faculty could be responsible for a program of cross-fertilization of ideas between churchmen and the faculty by sending faculty members out to gatherings of Chicago men at the various national denominational meetings. At such alumni gatherings they might set up some subject of discussion, chosen for an entire year and used in many different meetings, which would be given advance publicity and an advance bibliography, so that an hour of discussion at the convention night prove most helpful to both faculty and alumni. The faculty member could return to Chicago knowing more fully what the men on the field are thinking. In this connection I appreciated the study made by Dr. Chave recently. But such questionnaires, though helpful, are best when supplemented by some personal contacts, such as Dean Hawley's recent trip. This procedure of visiting about ten major denominations in their annual meetings and getting the Chicago men of that denomination together would have a similar effect.

I shall be glad to hear reactions from other alumni regarding some of the issues raised here.

From Duncan Littlefair at Grand Rapids, Michigan:

For some time now I have been wanting to write a letter of appreciation and appraisal to the Divinity School. I am using you as the recipient because you are most closely connected with the area of work in which I am interested. Then, too, perhaps my observations may be of some value to the occasional student who comes to you for

counsel. I use the term "occasional" because I have in mind students interested in the ministry. I hope I am entirely wrong in the use of the term, for I am most anxious to have your time entirely taken up by ministerial students. It is only a few years since I left the Divinity School, but I hope the events of those years have been enough to completely eliminate the notion that an advanced degree would be wasted in the practical work of the local church. My experience indicates that only the very thorough and rigorous training of a place like the Divinity School will equip a man for the tremendous job that needs to be done in the Christian church. Believe me, we need the best men, and they had better have the best training. If the financial problem of securing advanced training is too difficult, then we had better begin to search the local churches for help for such students as need it.

I went to Chicago with a B.D. degree. It was my conversion experience. There, for the first time, I found a releasing sense of freedom. The thrill of being able to think for myself without censure or artificial limitation was the beginning of a new concept of the possibilities of service. I had lived in mortal dread of the dissipation of my soul by the necessity of conforming to prejudice, ignorance, tradition, or simply the status quo. The Divinity School and the University with its demands that the individual think for himself and work out his own philosophy dispelled my dread.

On the basis of that experience and its value for me I proceeded from my first sermon to offer the same opportunity and demand the same responsibility from the people in my church. Their reactions have demonstrated to me at least the shocking need for such an approach. I say "shocking" because one normally assumes that such freedom is the birthright of every American. It becomes increasingly evident, however, that in business, society, the schools, and the churches there is very little freedom. And yet we all want it. With missionary zeal I am ready to proclaim and to continue proclaiming that the people in our churches are crying for someone to lead them out of bondage. Where there is any leadership at all, they respond enthusiastically and magnificently.

I want to add, and it is a most important addition, that this freedom is more than merely an opportunity to speak your mind. It is based upon the inherent dignity of the individual to think for himself, to work out his own problems, and to catch a vision of his unlimited potentiality through free creative interplay with the members of his community. It is this relationship that is responsible for all that we call human. It must be the object of our deepest religious concern.

This relationship has most serious implications for the minister in the conduct of his work. A thorough recognition of it would completely revolutionize the relationship of minister to congregation and Seminary preparation for entrance into the ministry. We are still operating on the medieval notion that the minister is in some way a priest and therefore in possession of peculiar powers or privileged access to God which is denied to the common man. We are still proceeding on the nineteenth-century notion

that the minister is the only educated person in the community and therefore must manipulate and direct the lives of his ignorant sheep. It is time Mount Sinai and Moses be recognized as belonging to the far-distant past. We cannot climb a mountain and there be personally intrusted with divine dictates which we must give to the people and if necessary enforce. Neither mountains, nor church steeples, nor pre-eminent spiritual qualifications will justify this destructive superstition.

Who is there among us capable of handing out answers to moral, economic, political, spiritual, or personal problems? Our knowledge has advanced far enough for us to know that, even if we could, it would be both wrong and useless to do so. Who is there among us capable of dispensing formulas and playing the role of God? The minister should not be asked to solve the problems of his church or his community. And certainly he should not arrogate to himself such responsibility or presume to such capacity and power.The minister is not good enough, and he does not know enough. He will never be good enough, and he will never know enough. In our modern world it is only the ignorant man who wants to be Moses. Our safety lies in the growth of our knowledge of the goodness of God.

It is the minister's job to raise the problems, indicate from his standpoint the significance of the issues, and discuss the purpose and level of solution. He is a member of a community directly charged with the responsibility of helping that community to discover for itself the goodness of God upon which it is dependent. As I understand it, this is the kind of interplay that should take place between faculty and students in the Divinity School. It is the creative relationship that should exist between the minister and the people of his community. This creative relationship is the freedom that releases the potentialities of the individual and makes him a responsible participating member in a democracy. Isn't this the basis of the Baptist and Free Church tradition, and isn't this the only basis upon which democracy can really function?

I hope it will not be necessary, but I want to make very clear to you and through you to the students that this type of approach to problems is not in any way an evasion of responsibility or an easy way out. It involves the straight facing of thorny and difficult problems. If the approach is honestly and conscientiously made, the minister finds himself disturbing not merely one section of his congregation or one party to a dispute but everyone concerned! It is too often too easy to pitch in with one side or another, particularly when your church constituency is overwhelmingly of one disposition. Surely our academic training makes clear that such partisanship is unscientific and largely ignorant, regardless of the practical efficiency of decisive action. One might add that our spiritual understanding supports our academic position in that we are all really sinners and the end to be sought transcends the particular perspective, regardless of how good and exalted it may be. There is urgent need in our communities for churches to stand for the goodness of God as opposed to or at least beyond our current ambitions and interests. Let me add that this understanding of the

role and opportunity of the minister places a burden on his capacity to carry tension. It is also a test of his faith in the capacity of man and the goodness of God. But, if we do not have these, what do we have and of what value is our leadership?

The effective exercise of the freedom I have been discussing is, of course, dependent on a confidence in ability to handle evidence. I suppose it is possible to have such confidence and such skill without the thorough training offered at the Divinity School, but this would apply only to the very rare person, and as yet I have not met such a person. The dogma of fundamentalism or authoritarianism is very deeply rooted, and a college "education" is scarcely even the beginning of a guaranty against it. I am sorry to say that I find very little difference in bigotry and selfishness between the college and the noncollege person. It is simply on a more sophisticated level with the college trained. Whether it is necessary or not, I am sure that any person would be very much better qualified as a leader of thought or "professional disturber" after the disciplines of the Divinity School's advanced degrees. To have confidence in your ability to evaluate critically the "recognized expert" is of no little value.

This brings me finally to the importance of a point of view. I am referring specifically to the use of the scientific method in the field of religion and the necessary result of a naturalistic philosophy. Whether naturalism is a necessary result or not, it becomes increasingly clear to me that it is only through the scientific testing of evidence that we can hope to arrive at a common language and the creative interchange necessary for mutual growth. It may not be universal, but the people I have met in two very different communities have been seeking such a criterion and standard for their religious quest. No other standard seems adequate to the demand of modern life. Superstition, tradition, the insularity of common Christianity, and the attempts to impose our wishes upon the universe are not good enough to sustain, much less encourage, the growth of the critical and tough-minded man of our day. The people are asking for bread, and they are being given stones. The Divinity School can go a long way toward meeting these needs. Send us some of your best. We need them, and we need them now.

In closing, let me say that I hope that these statements will finally "prime the pump" and get the members of our Divinity family to discussing and sharing their thoughts and experiences with us at the School and with each other.

WILLIAM N. HAWLEY
Dean of Students

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
July 12, 1949

THOUGHTS FROM THE EDITOR

In the next issue of the *Journal of Religion* there will be an article by Dean Loomer entitled "Christian Faith and Process Philosophy." This will be an extended discussion, much longer than has appeared previously, of the problems and possibilities discovered in developing the enduring apprehensions of the Christian Faith in terms of the philosophical framework which Dean Loomer and others in the Divinity School have been working with. In other words, this article will provide the best opportunity that the alumni have had yet whereby to get a clear understanding of how the philosophical work being done at the Divinity School helps to restore the relevance of the faith to the contemporary scene.

I take this opportunity to mention Dean Loomer's forthcoming article because many of you have expressed the desire to be kept informed on all the developments that are taking place now in the School. Many of you have expressed especial interest in having an opportunity to keep in touch with what Dean Loomer is doing. Because of the interest that many have manifested, we are, therefore, ordering a large number of reprints which will be placed at the disposal of the alumni. Because of printing costs, we are making a nominal charge of $0.20 a copy postpaid. The price for quantities of ten or more may be obtained on request. We are suggesting that you do not send postage stamps in payment unless your order is for three copies or less.

The appearance of Dean Loomer's article in the next issue of the *Journal of Religion* brings to my attention something that I have been wanting to say to you regarding the *Journal*. I do not know how many of you subscribe to the *Journal* or have opportunity to read it in a local library. My feeling is that the *Journal of Religion* is becoming a kind of literature which will do much to keep us informed on the intellectual developments at the Divinity School and also to promote the closer community which we are seeking to achieve now between the School and the field.

In the past, the *Journal of Religion* has been available to scholars anywhere who care to put in writing efforts that they were making to develop integrity between faith and culture. This is still true of the *Journal*. It is still concerned to make its pages available to the writings of scholarship everywhere, but recently it has been developing a parallel concern. That is, there is a concern now on the part of the Editorial Board to let the *Journal* also become a sensitive vehicle for communicating the particular philosophical and theological trends which the Divinity School today is striving to contribute to the total world of religious concern and inquiry. It is because of this new development in the *Journal's* policies that I enthusiastically commend it to you as a part of your regular reading diet.

The price of the subscription for one year is only $3.25 to alumni. I would like to urge all of you to pay for at least a trial subscription and read it faithfully. Then, if you feel in the mood to do so, write me a statement regarding your reactions.

NOTES FROM THE DEAN'S OFFICE

REGISTRATION

The registration in the Federated Theological Schools for the Spring Quarter was 198. Of this total number, 87 were registered in the Divinity School, 79 in the Chicago Theological Seminary, 15 in the Meadville Theological School, and 17 in the Disciples Divinity House.

CONVOCATION

At Spring Convocation, June 17, 1949, the following degrees were conferred:

Bachelor of Divinity

JOHN EMORY MCCAW

Thesis: Formula and Freedom among the Disciples

Master of Arts

THEODORE CLAUDE EDQUIST

Thesis: An Analysis of the Religious Insights of Walt Whitman

Doctor of Philosophy

MERRILL LAVERNE HUTCHINS

Thesis: The Relations between Church and State in France from 1905 to 1925

FACULTY NEWS

During the Summer Quarter, 1949, Myron T. Hopper of College of the Bible will be visiting professor in religious education and Paul Ramsey of Princeton Theological Seminary will be visiting professor in ethics.

CORRECTION

Charles Hartshorne, professor of philosophy in the Federated Theological Faculty, returned in March from the University of Chicago at Frankfort.

ALUMNI NEWS

MEMORIALS

We have received word from Henry G. Robins that his father, Henry Burke Robins, A.M. '*11*, Ph.D. '*12*, died March 11, 1949, in Orlando, Florida. He was Augustus Hopkins Strong Professor of History and Philosophy at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School until 1945.

PERSONALS

At the last meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis a Divinity School alumnus, Francis W. Beare, Ph.D. '*45*, was elected associate in council. Elected to the editorial committee of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* were Allen Wikgren, A.B. '*28*, M.A. '*29*, Ph.D. '*32*, and Herbert G. May, A.M. '*29*, Ph.D. '*32*.

A private limited edition of the Aitken Bible has been printed by the Muir Dawson Press in Los Angeles with an introduction by Edgar J. Goodspeed, B.D. '*97*, Ph.D. '*98*.

In celebration of the four-hundredth anniversary of the Prayer Book, Massey H. Shepherd, Ph.D. '*37*, professor of church history at the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, has just completed a comprehensive history of

The Book of Common Prayer. He has also been elected president of the American Society for Church History.

The dean of Gustavus-Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota, George F. Hall, Ph.D. *'35*, has just published a manual entitled *You Ask about Luther* printed by the Gustavus-Adolphus College Press.

Norman A. Buending, *'27–'28*, is now field office manager of the Social Security Administration in Chicago.

Winburn T. Thomas, *'33*, is now in Bangkok, Siam, at the American Presbyterian Mission after having escaped from Shanghai on the last scheduled flight on May 16, 1949.

Heber C. Snell, Ph.D. *'40*, teacher of "Bible" in the Institute of Religion, Logan, Utah, has written a college text, *Ancient Israel: Its Story and Meaning* (1948), which is to be reviewed by W. A. Irwin, B.D. *'17*, Ph.D. *'25*, in the *Journal of Religion.*

Winfred Garrison, Ph.D. *'97*, was Earl Lecturer at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, California, in mid-March. He reported an overflow audience to the lectures, with auditors hanging from the rafters.

Howard L. Parsons, Ph.D. *'46*, has accepted a position as assistant professor in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Tennessee.

Since leaving India last year, Robert Roth, Ph.D. *'47*, has become associate professor of philosophy of religion at Augustana College in Rock Island. While in India he had an interview with Gandhi shortly before he was killed and also with Nehru and Sheikh Abdullah of Kashmere.

As pastor of the First Methodist Church and director of the Wesley Foundation at the University of Minnesota, Virgil Kraft, *'38, '40*, has done a good deal of speaking throughout the country and flown his own plane to meet widely separated engagements. He is as well a frequent contributor to religious journals, particularly the *Christian Advocate.*

President of the Mid-West Section of the National Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis for this year is William A. Irwin, B.D. *'17*, Ph.D. *'25*, and the secretary of this section of the Society is Merrill M. Parvis, Ph.D. *'44.*

C. E. Ashcraft, M.A. *'17*, has been a professor at Bonebrake Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio, since 1926 and dean of the seminary since 1929. He has written a *Manual for Juniors* (1933).

Charles S. Braden, Ph.D. *'26*, has published a study of American cults and minority religious movements entitled *They Also Believe* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1949).

Eugene A. Luening, A.B. *'40*, is a member of the board of directors of the Massachusetts Council of Churches.

Alonzo Willard Fortune, B.D. *'05*, Ph.D. *'15*, has retired from the Central Church in Lexington, Kentucky. He is still living in Lexington.

Frederick A. Schilling, *'21*, has been elected to the position of associate professor of biblical studies, (Episcopal) Church Divinity School of the Pacific in Berkeley, California.

Now retired from active duty as an

army chaplain, Colonel Harry C. Fraser, *'32–'33*, is board member of the Glendale College Student Christian Association and vice-president of the Glendale U.N. group. He has had many speaking and preaching engagements on Japan in local churches, colleges, and service clubs (Los Angeles area) and will be supervisory chaplain in five camps in Sequoia National Park this summer.

Nellie M. Wagar, *'39–'43*, is executive secretary of the Protestant Weekday Christian Education Council and director of the Interfaith Committee for Weekday Religious Education in Berkeley, California. She writes: "Helped the local people to develop interest in having a real Council of Churches. In March, 1948, they officially became the Church Federation of Berkeley-Albany. After a year, we have organized many departments and projects of city-wide work and challenged some of the leading laymen to serve as leaders in the work. I have remained as executive secretary of the new organization and feel my best work has been in giving lay people a vision of the things churches may do together. Berkeley has a great deal of complacent pride about its churches and social welfare. Their prejudices and indifference are so well hidden that the people scarcely know there are real problems here. Decent housing for Negroes and Orientals obscures the fact of restrictive covenants. Unemployment is likewise larger for these groups. The many professors at the University as well as students who are interested in international relations are active in setting up forums and seminars, but church people take little active interest.

"While not more than 10 per cent of the non-Roman Catholic people attend church on any Sunday, the churches are not interested in a united program of outreach and evangelism. The big churches say they have all the people they can take care of now and are not able to put on a program that might double their membership. They do not say this in so many words, but they carefully avoid the issue by saying they have all the work they can do now. Some of the pastors have been urging the rest to join them in the National Christian Teaching Mission of the Federal Council, but three or four of the large churches refuse to get interested."

[PRINTED IN U·S·A·]